

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 19, 2005. Claims 1 to 38 remain in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 27, 37 and 38 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The title was objected to as allegedly being non-descriptive. A new title has been provided for as recited above. Withdrawal of the objection to the title is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 to 9, 11, 14, 15, 17 to 20, 23, 26 to 30, 33 and 36 to 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0264947 (Okada), Claims 2, 3, 12, 13, 24, 25, 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Okada in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,309 (Ito), and Claims 6, 10, 16, 21 and 31 were rejected under § 103(a) over Okada in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,744,968 (Imai). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns replacing an object in a reproduced digital data stream. According to one aspect of the invention, if an object with a predetermined attribute is found to exist in a data stream (e.g., a current time at which the data stream was recorded), the object (e.g., time at which the stream was recorded) is replaced in the data stream with a new object (e.g., current real-time) based on information of the object when the data stream is reproduced.

With specific reference to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is an image processing apparatus for reproducing a recorded digital data stream, comprising determination means for determining whether an object having a predetermined attribute exists in the recorded digital data stream, and reproducing means for reproducing the

recorded digital data stream while replacing the object with a new object generated based on information of the object being reproduced, in a case where the determination means determines that the object having the predetermined attribute exists.

Amended independent Claim 7 is an apparatus claim, amended independent Claim 11 is a method claim, and amended independent Claim 37 is a computer medium claim, each of which substantially correspond to Claim 1.

Amended independent Claim 17 includes features along the lines of Claim 1, but is more specifically directed to an image processing apparatus for reproducing a recorded digital data stream, comprising determination means for determining whether an object having a predetermined attribute exists in the recorded digital data stream, designation means for designating a reproducing form of the object having the predetermined attribute from a plurality of reproducing forms, and reproducing control means for reproducing the recorded digital data stream while replacing the object with a predetermined icon reproduced based on the reproducing form designated by the designation means, in a case where the determination means determines that the object having the predetermined attribute exists.

Amended independent Claim 27 is a method claim and amended independent Claim 38 is a computer medium claim, each of which substantially corresponds to Claim 27.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention. In particular, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of reproducing a recorded digital data stream while replacing an object with a new object generated based on information of the object being reproduced, or replacing the object with a predetermined icon based on a

designated reproducing form, in a case where it is determined that the object has a predetermined attribute.

Okada is merely seen to disclose a reproduction method for a program chain in which mark points are set and then a reproduction order of cells is set to the mark points. However, Okada is not seen to disclose or to suggest anything with regard to determining whether an object with a predetermined attribute exists in a digital data stream and then replacing the object, much less that when a recorded digital data stream is reproduced, the object is replaced with a new object generated based on information of the object being reproduced, or replaced with a predetermined icon based on a designated reproducing form, in a case where it is determined that the object has a predetermined attribute. Thus, independent Claims 1, 11, 17, 27, 37 and 38 are not believed to be anticipated by Okada.

With regard to the § 103(a) rejections over Okada in view of Ito, Applicants note that Ito, by virtue of its January 10, 2000 U.S. filing date and its April 23, 2002 issue date, qualifies as prior art to the subject application only under § 102(e). Additionally, at the time of the present invention, as evidenced by the assignee listed on the cover page of Ito and the deed of Assignment for the subject application recorded at Reel 011545, Frame 0589 on February 9, 2001, both Ito and the subject application we subject to an obligation of common ownership to Canon Kabushiki Kaisha. Accordingly, under § 103(c), the U.S. patent to Ito should removed as a reference as far as any § 103(a) rejections are concerned. Therefore, the § 103(a) rejections should be withdrawn.


Nonetheless, Ito and Imai have been studied and neither of those references are seen to disclose or to suggest anything that, when combined with Okada, would have disclosed or suggested the features of the present invention. In particular, any permissible combination of Okada and Ito or Imai is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the

feature of reproducing a recorded digital data stream while replacing an object with a new object generated based on information of the object being reproduced, or replacing the object with a predetermined icon based on a designated reproducing form, in a case where it is determined that the object has a predetermined attribute.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Edward A. Kmett

Attorney Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 100232v1